(b) whether the Centre has contested the jurisdiction of the Commission to inquire into executive decisions taken by the Centre under various Central statutes; and

(c) whether the Commission has since given its verdict on the issue of jurisdiction to hear matters relating to Central approval for Dabhol Power Company; if so, summary thereof?

THE MINISTEROF STATE IN TOE MINISTRY OFPOWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTI MEHTA): (a) and (b) On the basis of legal opinion obtained from the Attorney General for India, the Government of India (Ministry of Power) had filed an objection before the Justice Kurdukar Commission of Inquiry (Dabhol Power Project) challenging its jurisdiction to inquire into executive decisions taken by the Central Government agencies under various Central Statutes. At the instance of the Commission, the relevant papers relating to authorization given for filing such objections on behalf of the Union of India, were shown to Justice S.P Kurdukar at the hearing of the Commission held on 7th February, 2003. No documents relating to the project have been shown to the Commission.

(c) At its hearing held on 24th March, 2003, the Commission has passed its order stating that the question of jurisdiction cannot be decided by the Commission and that whosoever wants to challenge the constitutional validity of the notification of the Government of Maharashtra in laying down the 'Terms of Reference' of the Commission, may approach the appropriate forum. In view of the dispute on the issue with the Government of Maharashtra, a Suit has been filed under Article 131 of the Constitution of India before the Supreme Court of India in which the Government of Maharashtra and the Commission of Inquiry have been made the 1st and 2nd defendants respectively. The matter was mentioned before the Court on 9-4-2003 when the Apex court was pleased to stay further proceedings in so far as they relate to the Petitioner, *i.e.* the Union of India.

Assistance provided by PFC and REC to A. P.

4908. SHRI RAJU PARMAR

SHRI LAJPAT RAI:

Will the Minister of POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether Power Finance Corporation (PFC) and Rural Electrification Corporation (REC) are providing financial assistance to Andhra Pradesh Central Power Distribution Company. Limited (APCPDCL) for purchase of single phase energy meters,

(b) if so, the details of financial assistance provided and the quantity of meters purchased by APCPDCL;

(c) whether orders placed on BHEL and other suppliers have been curtailed by APCPDCL without assigning any reasons;

(d) if so, whether PFC and REC will probe the matter and order for the restoration of balance quantities placed on BHEL and other units; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRIMATI JAYAWANTIMEHTA): (a) Power Finance Corporation (PFC) is providing financial assistance to Andhra Pradesh Central Power Distribution Company Limited (APCPDCL) for purchase of single phase energy meter. Rural Electrification Corporation (REC) has not released any financial assistance to APCPDCL.

(b) The details of financial assistance provided by PFC to APCPDCL for purchase of single phase energy meters are as under :—

Scheme	Date of Sanction	Sanction Amount	No. of Single phase meters	Status
Providing trivector meters for 11KV feeders and high quality electromechanical meters for LT consumers	04-02-2003	Rs. 157.70 crore	6,00,000 (approx-value Rs.120 crore)	Loan documents are yet to be executed
Counterpart funding for Hyderabad City Distribution Circle under APDRP	09-12-2002	Rs. 153.64 crores	5.38 lakhs (approx. value Rs. 53.78 crore)	Loan documents are yet to be executed

(c) PFC is not aware of placement of any order by APCPDCL or curtailment of it to BHEL and other suppliers.

(d) and (e) Question do not arise in view of above.